
A table of contents for *Theological Students Fellowship (TSF) Bulletin (US)* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_tsfbulletin-us.php

TSF BULLETIN

MAY–JUNE 1987
VOL. 10, NO. 5
$4.50

Introducing This Issue
Vernon Grounds 3

Singing With The Fundamentalists
Annie Dillard 4

American Evangelicalism: Quo Vadis?
Vernon Grounds 7

From Truth to Authority to Responsibility: The Shifting Focus of Evangelical Hermeneutics, 1915–1986 (Part II)
Douglas Jacobsen 10

The Theology of Acts
F.F. Bruce 15

Bibliography on Aging for Pastors and Other Church Leaders
David O. Moberg 17

Leadership '88 Conference 20

REVIEW ESSAYS:

The Chronology of the Apostle Paul
James D.G. Dunn 21

Reading the New Testament as a Canonical Text
Scot McKnight 22

Childs Responds to McKnight 24

Taking Mennonite History Seriously
Dennis D. Martin 25

Early Christians in the Roman Empire
Christopher Haas 27

Book Reviews and Comments 29

Vol. 10 Index 46

A Publica[illegible]of
THEOLO[illegible]
STUDENT
FELLOWSHIP

foolishly deluded by religion. So contrary to what might be expected, this fantastic steamroller trying to destroy every trace of Christian faith has failed. All the efforts of the most powerful government that's ever existed in the world, in the sense of taking to itself the most power over the citizenry, has been unable to shape these people into the sort of citizens it wants them to be. Of all the signs of our times, this is the one that should rejoice the heart of any Christian most, and for that matter of anyone who loves the creativity of our mortal existence.[2]

God, I am constrained to think, delights in surprises, forcing finite foretellers—except when He grants them as He did with the Biblical prophets a God's-eye perspective on history—to admit that the future is unpredictable.

But at least three plus consequences flow from our ignorance. First, that ignorance induces a spirit of humility and moderates any claim to predictive pretensions—or ought to do so. Second, our ignorance is actually an antidote against unwarranted gloom and despair. Thus Martin Marty quotes an affirmation which he heard at a conference, "We don't know enough about the future to be absolutely pessimistic." And since we don't, a relative optimism is in order rather than an absolute pessimism. Third, our ignorance inspires us to take seriously our responsibility for cooperating with God in bringing about a future much more substantially fulfills the petition, "Your will be done on earth as it is in heaven."

Writing on "Future Directions for American Evangelicals," theologian John Jefferson Davis of Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary gives us some guidelines regarding the shape and thrust of our lives and activities as we move towards and into the third millennium if as a Christian entity we are to make an increasing impact. "As American evangelicals we must re-affirm our commitment to the complete truthfulness and authority of Scripture, but with a focus not on the agenda set by the historical-critical method but rather on the coming contest with our world religions—with Hinduism, Buddhism, and Islam; that to our knowledge of the Holy Spirit as Illuminator, Regenerator and Sanctifier we have the knowledge of the Spirit as Healer and Liberator and Spirit of praise; and that our missionary agenda be re-oriented toward the needs of the hidden peoples, and especially toward the megacities of the third world." Then with the optimism of a postmillennarian which is his eschatological stance, Davis concludes: "This is indeed an exciting time in which to be a Christian. It is an exciting time to be serving Christ in the ministry. I believe that the time of the greatest expansion of the Christian Church in all of human history is just ahead of us. May God help us, individually and collectively, to be on the cutting edge of Christ's Kingdom as we approach the twenty-first century."[3] Perhaps not too many of us are that optimistic, but why not say with Robert Browning, "The best is yet to be"? Or to resurrect a watchword of an older evangelicalism, "The future is as bright as the promises of God."

Quo vadis, American evangelicalism? GOK.

1. Donald M. Mackay, "The Health of the Evangelical Body," *Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation,* Volume 38, Number 4, December 1986, p. 259.
2. Malcolm Muggeridge, *The End of Christendom* (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1980), pp. 38–39, 41–42.
3. John Jefferson Davis, "Future Directions For American Evangelicals," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society,* 29/4, December 1986, p. 467.

From Truth to Authority to Responsibility: The Shifting Focus of Evangelical Hermeneutics, 1915-1986 (Part II)

by Douglas Jacobsen

The Post-Classic Evangelical Generation: The Hermeneutics of Responsibility

The third generation of Evangelical hermeneuts I would like to discuss is the Post-Classical generation. The central metaphor of hermeneutics for this generation seems to be the concept of responsibility. Let me emphasize the words "seem to be" in the preceding sentence, and let me do that for three reasons. First, this new generation of Evangelicals is still in the process of congealing and it is hard to photograph this moving target. Second, Post-Classic Evangelicalism, as it is emerging into the form of a community of biblical interpreters, has taken on a multifaceted and pluralistic form; thus, it is more difficult to isolate a center of hermeneutical concern in this generation than it was for earlier more uniform Evangelical movements. And third, Post-Classic Evangelicalism was brought to birth in a different manner than the two other generations already examined. Post-Classical Evangelicalism was pushed into existence as much as it developed as a positive reaction to changes taking place in American society. The rise of Post-Classic Evangelicalism, needs, then to be understood in the context of this dialectical process. Let me begin by discussing the positive roots of the movement—its reaction to the historical experience in the years immediately prior to 1975.

Post-Classic Evangelicalism's hermeneutic of responsibility arose partially as a reaction to the preceding fifteen years of American history. That period had seen the demise of America's authoritative status of "policeman of the world." Overseas America was being defeated by (in typical rhetoric of the period) a "third rate nation" (i.e., Vietnam), and at home the country was divided over issues of war, race, and age. The expansive if troubled optimism of the fifties and early sixties was shattered. Americans were asking what had gone wrong. The world which had once seemed so agreeable to American interests and values now seemed imexplicably truculent. Rather than merely pronouncing answers, many Americans were asking questions—profound questions.

The changes that confronted Evangelicals in the mid-seventies were not limited to the political-cultural realm. Amer-

Douglas Jacobsen is Professor of Theology at Messiah College, Grantham, PA.

ica's religious atmosphere was also changing, and once again these changes confronted Evangelicalism with a challenge. By 1975 Evangelicalism could no longer claim public leadership of conservative Christianity in America. A resurgent Fundamentalism challenged Evangelical leadership from within the ecclesiastical ranks, while a popular wave of conservative religious revival (i.e., the Jesus people, etc.) challenged evangelicalism from outside the realm of institutionalized religion. Compounding these developments was the interdenominational charismatic renewal (again a non-Evangelical conservative religious movement) and the increasing impulse of many mainline conservative Christians to stay in their own denominations and fight to restore the prominence of conservative theological leadership within those denominations. By 1975 Evangelicalism could hardly claim a monopoly on evangelical Christianity in America.

Perhaps even more disturbing to Evangelicals than any of these external developments were changes within the Evangelical community itself. On a superficial level, the question was the degree to which many of the large social questions of the period had penetrated the walls of Evangelicalism and had to come to divide that house against itself—issues of social justice, women's rights, homosexual rights, etc. On a deeper level, however, the question was whether or not the intrusion of these specific issues had opened the door to a wholesale invasion of Evangelicalism by the questioning anti-authoritarian spirit of the age. The wall of separation that Fundamentalism had built and that Classic Evangelicalism had enlarged, modified, and civilized seemed to be crashing down. The boundary line of the acceptable community of interpreters—the boundary line between the believing community and the public to be evangelized—seemed to be unclear and/or full of holes.

For years evangelicals had been defending what they took to be orthodox reading of the Bible to various audiences in various ways. Now all of a sudden from both within and without the ranks came unignorable charges that Evangelicalism's orthodoxy was in numerous ways deficient. Evangelicals were charged by others, and they charged each other, with being hypocritical in social ethics, with being captive to the materialistic spirit of the age, with being insufficiently informed about or concerned with worship, with being woefully ignorant of the larger historical traditions of Christianity, with being prejudiced against all non-white non-male non-Western thought, and with being inferior scholars. The list could be extended. It was not only the Evangelical community in the broad sense that was being asked these questions, individual evangelicals felt the pressure in their own individual souls. No better personal account of this can be found than that of Bernard Ramm in the opening lines of his *After Fundamentalism*:

> I had just finished a lecture on my version of American evangelical theology. When I was asked by a shrewd listener to define American evangelical theology more precisely, I experienced inward panic. Like a drowning man who sees parts of his life pass before him at great speed (an experience I have had), so my theology passed before my eyes. I saw my theology as a series of doctrines picked up here and there, like a rag-bag collection. To stutter out a reply to that question was one of the most difficult things I have ever had to do on a public platform.
>
> The experience set me to reflection. Why was my theology in the shape it was? The answer that kept coming back again and again was that theologically I was a product of the orthodox-liberal debate that has gone on for a century. It is a debate that has warped evangelical theology.[28]

Ramm's experience has been the experience of countless other Evangelicals. None of these individuals, or very few at the most, want to deny any of the old Evangelical orthodoxy, but the old picture just doesn't hang together for them any more. Evangelicalism, at least in its classic form, seems skewed. These people believe it is deficient. Somehow contemporary Evangelicals have to come up with a new model, and many sense it has to be done from scratch. As Ramm expresses well, such a task is not easy, and in the initial stages of such a reconstruction one really can do little but stutter.

While these neophyte Post-Classic Evangelicals were trying to stammer out their first attempts at an answer to the problems they saw, they were quickly confronted by their angry Classic Evangelical older brothers. In the mid-seventies, with the influence of Evangelicalism seemingly waning, the vocal uncertainties and questioning of the emerging Post-Classic generation of Evangelical hermeneuts seemed like nothing so much as treason. Classic Evangelicalism struck back at what they (rightfully in part) saw as an attack on themselves. The most vocal of these defenders of the old way was Harold Lindsell in his *The Battle for the Bible*. That book begins as follows:

> I regard the subject of this book, biblical inerrancy to be the most important theological topic of this age. A great battle rages about it among the people called evangelicals. I did not start the battle and wish it were not essential to discuss it. The only way to avoid it would be to remain silent. And silence on this matter would be a grave sin.[29]

What Lindsell felt forced to break his silence about was the fact that numerous individuals who wanted to claim the name Evangelical no longer looked to him as if they really were Evangelicals. Lindsell, following the typical language of Classic Evangelicalism, made infallibility the verbal rapier of his book, and because of that the book sounds largely like a rehash of earlier debates within Classic Evangelicalism. Beneath that linguistic continuity, however, a new debate was brewing—a debate over hermeneutics.

Lindsell was clear on this point. "Those who advocate inerrancy," he said, "take the Bible in its plain and obvious sense."[30] In contrast to these real Evangelicals, Lindsell argued, a new group of individuals had appeared within "the people called evangelicals" who sought to squirm out from underneath the authority of the Bible through the use of "hermeneutics." Lindsell did not necessarily "un-Christian" these people—in fact, at one point he calls them "earnest and sincere men"[31]—but he doesn't trust their motives. He would gladly allow them to believe what they would, but he was unwilling to grant them any claim to "the badge" (his term) Evangelical. His argument is standard fare Classic Evangelicalism. These new breed Evangelicals may still look Evangelical, but it is only a question of time: Ultimately they or their progeny will fall away from the historic orthodox Christian faith. These contemporary so-called Evangelicals have consciously or unconsciously claimed a critical autonomy over the biblical text through their hermeneutical exercises. Once that move is made, any appeal to authority one might want to make is gone, and Evangelicalism, at least as the Classic generation of Evangelicals defined it, is over.

Before proceeding, two questions need to be asked and answered. In his book Lindsell seems to assume that these

new breed Evangelicals are sneaky people. They seem to want to hide their real opinions behind a label that doesn't fit. Why, he asks, haven't these new-breed Evangelicals announced their agenda clearly and in full public view as preceding generations of evangelicals have? Aren't they really only trying to delude both themselves and others that they are not either heretics or on the slippery slope to heresy?

I think the answer to the first question is implicit in the question itself. This is a "post-classic" generation, living in a post-heroic age. It is not out to storm the world with the Bible. It is merely trying to make sense of both the world and the Bible. To ask Post-Classic Evangelicalism to be clear and complete in its ideas may, at this point in history, simply be a request impossible to meet. I would go even further. I think most Post-Classic Evangelicals harbor a certain jealousy of the self-confident authoritative mood of their Classic Evangelical predecessors. That authoritative mood, however, has simply ceased to be an option for this new generation. To a significant degree, the emergence of Post-Classic Evangelicalism can be described as a fall from relative certitude to relative uncertainty, and uncertainty has never been a good ground from which to launch a major offensive on a still prominent religious tradition.

With regard to the second question—are these new Evangelicals heretics?—the basic answer is simple: No, they are not—even Lindsell admits that. However, Post-Classic Evangelicals have made Classic Evangelicals extremely uneasy, and that uneasiness at times has undoubtedly been strong enough for some Classic Evangelicals for them logically to postulate the necessity of a heretical source. Why are there such frictions between these two evangelical groups? My hunch is this: Post-Classic Evangelicalism's authority hermeneutic is in and of itself the most telling critique anyone can make of the earlier movement. The appeal to authority rests on a certain sense of self-evidency. If that self-evidency evaporates, authority becomes no more than shouting in the wind. And that is exactly what many Evangelicals felt like they were doing anyway during the early and mid-seventies—a time when the influence of "official" Evangelicalism was still on the ebb. The rise of Post-Classic Evangelicalism not only rocked the boat, it hit home.

Seen in this light, Lindsell's book stands simultaneously as a last hurrah for Classic Evangelicalism and as a prodding stick that forced Post-Classic Evangelicals to state their case. And, once flushed into the open—once they had been asked that disturbing question by the shrewd listener and had beginning to be nudged to the door by their Classic Evangelical colleagues—Post-Classic Evangelicals did begin to stammer out their answers. Not all of them said the same thing. But all of them seem to operate with the same basic dictate in mind: The age of authority has passed, and a new age of Evangelical responsibility has dawned.

One of the earliest coherent statements of Post-Classic Evangelicalism's hermeneutic of responsibility is Robert K. Johnston's *Evangelicals at an Impasse*. The content of the book revolves around three particular issues of debate within evangelicalism—"women's role in the church and family, social ethics, and homosexuality"—but the heart of the book is hermeneutics. And, in his concern with hermeneutics, Johnston sets his sights clearly against Classic Evangelicalism's hermeneutic of authority:

> Beyond my desire to address specific theological issues [i.e., those mentioned above] and to suggest directions in which evangelicals might profitably move, I have attempted to give voice to this book to a more basic and persistent concern. That evangelicals, all claiming a common Biblical norm, are reaching contradictory theological formulations on many of the major issues they are addressing suggests the problematic nature of their present understanding of theological interpretation. To argue that the Bible is authoritative, but to be unable to come to anything like agreement on what it says (even with those who share an evangelical commitment), is self-defeating.[32]

Johnston's critique of Classic Evangelicalism sounds hauntingly like Classic Evangelicalism's earlier critique of Fundamentalism. Unable to agree on the truth they possessed, Fundamentalists backed off into their own corners and later came out fighting. The same scenario was now repeating itself among those critics of Fundamentalism, and the divisive issue was authority. Johnston's suggested cure was to replace authority with a new center—one that would unite rather than divide. That center was hermeneutics, and it was hermeneutics done with a pluralistic sense of responsibility. Johnston's intention was not to do away with all talk of authority, but to provide authority with a substantial and real foundation that would make such appeals meaningful. For Johnston, that foundation is seen as residing in the form of a rough, but responsibly arrived at, consensus within the accepted community of interpreters. Johnston pleads:

> . . .surely a commitment to biblical authority is a commitment to take this common task of theological interpretation seriously—more seriously than we are doing at the present time. It is a commitment to hold together with those who share a similar norm, to carry on mature conversations, to affirm a oneness in the gospel while working together on the theological issues that currently divide. Evangelicals need the collective wisdom of the best minds and spirits working together on the theological task of the church. Problems in theological formulations will prove ongoing, but the interpretive project will have a much better chance of success in the clear air of fellowship than in an atmosphere fouled by competition.
>
> The common interpretive task entails risks, but such is a necessary ingredient of a commitment to biblical authority.[33]

For Johnston, this above described sense of comradeship, while necessary in a Post-Classic Evangelical hermeneutic, is not a sufficient criterion of validity in interpretation. We need not only to be responsible to each other, Johnston states, we also need to be responsible to the three "constitutive theological components" that are part of any biblical hermeneutical exercise. These are the Bible, the Christian tradition, and contemporary culture. According to Johnston, it is the renewal of "careful, creative, communal listening to these theological sources" that will provide a fresh start for Evangelical biblical hermeneutics. He explains his ideal as follows:

> The word "hermeneutics" (Greek, hermeneuein), as used in the New Testament, means to expound or to translate. It is particularly in the latter sense of translation, or "bridging the gap" (Berkouwer), that the theologian is indeed a hermeneutician. Theologians must build bridges with their interpretation between the biblical writers, the church fathers, and contemporary Christians. Their interpretations will suceed only if they are based on the sound analysis of their constituative theological components.[34]

Johnston's image of hermeneutics as bridge-building (with

the hermeneutics of responsibility it entails) has recently been echoed by John Stott. In his new book on the art of preaching, entitled *Between Two Worlds: The Art of Preaching in the Twentieth Century*, he states:

> It is because preaching is not exposition only but communication, not just the exegesis of a text but the conveying of a God-given message to living people who need to hear it, that I am going to develop a different metaphor to illustrate the essential nature of preaching. It is non-biblical in the sense that it is not explicitly used in Scripture, but I hope to show that what it lays upon us is a fundamentally biblical task. The metaphor is that of bridge-building.[35]

Stott especially places one more overlay of responsibility on top of the two already outlined by Johnston. Post-Classic Evangelicals needs to be responsible to each other, they need to be responsible to the three theologically constitutive sources of the hermeneutician's work, and (Stott's addition) they need to take upon themselves the responsibility to communicate. Communication in this context takes on a rather pointed meaning, I think. Post-Classic Evangelicals do not see that the message of the Bible actually gets communicated—and communicated not just in a simplified manner (i.e., one which maintains an air of authority by avoiding complexity), but in a manner that takes the full mutlifacetedness of the text and the reader into serious consideration. What Johnston and Stott are both saying is that we can no longer deceive ourselves into believing that we should just read the Bible in a simple and objective manner and then communicate our findings to a passive audience. We are all limited in our perceptions and judgments and because of this we need outside checks on our interpretive conclusions. Rather than always announcing the truth, we need to listen to how our voices echo off the walls of the evangelical community of interpreters with which we have come to align ourselves—of which we find ourselves a part. We need also to listen to other echoes rebounding off those walls. And, we need to enlarge the walls of the house (at least historically speaking) well beyond the narrow confines they currently define.

I think that the picture of hermeneutics presented by Johnston and Stott defines the core of what responsibility is coming to mean in Post-Classic Evangelicalism. There are, however, at least a few other voices that need to be heard if our picture of Post-Classic hermeneutics is to be really well-rounded. Very briefly let me survey just three of these alternative renditions of the hermeneutics of responsibility currently being voiced.

One alternative rendering of Evangelical hermeneutical responsibility comes from evangelical Anabaptism. Perhaps the leading figure in this category is Ron J. Sider, but others could be mentioned (e.g., Donald Dayton, Jim Wallis, John H. Yoder). This version of the Post-Classic Evangelical hermeneutic of responsibility runs roughly as follows: The problem facing Evangelicalism and its difficulty with interpreting the Bible stems primarily from an unwillingness really to do what the Bible says. What we need is not better exegesis or scholarship of any kind, but we need to do what the Bible says. In that doing, the message of the Bible will both become clear and our message will become authoritative. The truth of the Bible is not an abstract academic truth about the world, but truth about human relations—both with each other and with God. One of the first indications that this group represented a significant force within Evangelicalism was the Chicago Declaration of 1973. Since that time the influence of this type of thought has only spread. Currently I think it is safe to say that concerns regarding the responsibility actually to live with our interpretations of the Bible has leavened all of contemporary Evangelicalism—it is no longer just an Anabaptist concern.

A different explication of contemporary Evangelical responsibility hermeneutics come from William J. Abraham. Rather than seeking (like Johnston) to overcome the current disunities within evangelicalism, Abraham suggests the opposite. He calls for making a virtue out of our vice of division. The real problem would be to "seek to heal [our] wounds too quickly." Abraham is very pessimistic about the Classic Evangelical approach to the Bible. That experiment, he says, simply has failed. Evangelicalism currently faces "an internal crises unlikely to be resolved by further tinkering from within." At this point in time, "evangelicals need to turn to radically alternative models of their own heritage."[36]

Not surprisingly Abraham, himself a Wesleyan, turns to John Wesley to find that radical, yet still evangelical, model for restructuring Evangelicalism. His suggestion is that we should set aside uniformity as a goal, recenter our sense of connectedness on the Bible alone, and take a deep breath of Wesley's catholicity of vision. Then within this perspective, we should strive for the fullest and most nuanced and most traditionally distinctive presentations of the full message of the Bible we can muster. We are family, Abraham says. We are kin. Let us then get about the process of presenting, as best we can from our different perspectives within the large evangelical umbrella, the message of the gospel to a world hungry for spiritual renewal. None of our traditions (e.g., Calvinist, Wesleyan, Anabaptist) is identical with the truth of the gospel. Abraham even allows the possibility that evangelicalism as a whole is misconceived. All "evangelicals have a duty to acknowledge the experimental character of their position[s]. All should recognize the contested character of the heritage, revise the present climate of opinion accordingly, and then proceed to provoke one another to love and good works." The sense of hermeneutical responsibility that Abraham envisions is one of theological and academic excellency in the presentation of our alternative views of the Bible combined with the responsibility to be open to, and non-judgmental of, alternative views. It is the responsibility of undefensive scholarship combined with a responsibility to be about the work of the kingdom in love.[37]

A third variant which attempts to outline a hermeneutic of responsibility for Post-Classic Evangelicals is presented by Harvie Conn of Westminster Seminary. Conn is a former missionary and brings to his work all the typical traits one would expect from such an individual. He is open to other cultures

Perhaps the hermeneutic of responsibility runs the risk of relativism, but I don't think that it is a necessary correlate of the position. In due time, the weaknesses of this movement will undoubtedly make themselves known, just as the weaknesses of Fundamentalism and Classic Evangelicalism made themselves evident in the past.

and their insights into the scripture, and he does not think Western modes of thought and theology should be crammed down non-Western spiritual mouths. But Conn goes beyond these typical missionary concerns. Not only do we need to act more politely toward the cultures whose members we seek to evangelize, we need to learn from these Christians—and by learning, Conn does not just mean to be encouraged by these peoples' joyful and zealous piety. He means actually to learn—to garner cognitive input from these non-first-world Christians. Responsibility means, for Conn, the development of "multiperspectivalism [as] a style of life, a hermeneutic, a way of thinking." When Evangelicals adopt this style of hermeneutics theology will become, he says, "more of a dynamic process than one virtually completed in the West."[38]

In many ways Conn's position brings us full circle back to Johnston's from an international perspective. Like Johnston, Conn has a triad that should govern our interpretation of the Bible: the normative position of the Bible, social time and place, and the existential perspective of our humanity as images of God." These three, Conn says, are to be woven together into a "symphonic theology," an artistic creation. Here again Conn's language echoes that of Johnston, or Johnston's echoes Conn's. Whichever came first is no longer the issue, however. Echoes of responsibility in one form or another are currently reverberating off the walls of evangelicalism all around the world. In all these cases there is also the sense that that hermeneutical responsibility must be artistically conceived, skillfully crafted, and workably presented.

Conclusion

It is necessary to ask how this new Post-Classic hermeneutic of responsibility will help Evangelicals function in the contemporary world. At this point this question must be phrased in the future tense, and my speculations will be short. I see primarily four things that this new hermeneutical metaphor might enable Evangelicals to do.

The first relates to international developments. By the end of this decade a majority of the Christians in the world will live in the non-West. If American Evangelicals want to relate in a positive way to this majority of the world Christian population, it will be necessary to divest themselves of even more of their pretensions to biblical hermeneutical objectivity than they have already. The need in the future will be to learn about the Bible from our non-Western brothers and sisters. A hermeneutic of responsibility opens the door to those developments.

A second positive function that this hermeneutic of responsibility might have in the future is to help Evangelicals engage the political questions of the day from a more adequate base than they currently do. If Evangelicals really become willing to pay hermeneutical attention to comtemporary culture, that will provide a point of contact with the larger culture that is presently lacking in much Evangelical political theologizing.

Third, I think the humble admission that hermeneutics is difficult work can only benefit a people that claim to be nothing more than sinners saved by grace. Evangelicalism has always made a better ideology of service than of rule. Claims to posess either absolute truth or absolute authority can so easily be bent in a domineering direction. In an age that has more than its fair share of totalitarian-oriented regimes, an American witness of Evangelical service can certainly do no harm.

Finally, I think that a metaphor of responsibility has opened the doors of communication between evangelicals and non-evangelicals to a degree unprecedented since the turn of the century. This could be either a blessing or a boon, but I think it is an advance nonetheless.

So much for the good. Is there a down side risk in all this? Is there, as the editorial from *Christianity Today* at the start of this article suggested, the potential for cataclysm in these changes? The answer is an obvious yes. But if it is too early to adequately document the strengths of the position, it is too early to delineate its weaknesses. Perhaps the hermeneutic of responsibility runs the risk of relativism, but I don't think that it is a necessary correlate of the position. In due time, the weaknesses of this movement will undoubtedly make themselves known, just as the weaknesses of Fundamentalism and Classic Evangelicalism made themselves evident in the past. For now, however, a new generation of Evangelicals seems content to live with this new hermeneutic and to see where it will gradually lead. After all, the changes taking place do "appear quite imperceptible" when viewed "from day to day." Only "in the span of a generation" will it become apparent where our decisions of today have led us.

---

[1] I use the term "evangelical" in at least three ways in this article, let me distinguish these uses in the following manner. When I use the term with a lower case "e," I am referring to that long-standing pattern of American Christian religious piety that emphasizes the need to conserve the received formulations of theology and that stresses the importance of warm-hearted religion and the experience of conversion. Evangelicalism when capitalized refers to that primarily northern coalition of religious groups that came into existence at the end of the nineteenth century in reaction to a perceived growing threat of liberalism within the northern churches. The various other Evangelical movements I identify (Evangelical with an "E" and a preceding adjective) exist primarily as historical sub-groups within Evangelicalism, but at times they reach outside Evangelicalism to recover other aspects of the evangelical tradition.

[2] For John Warwick Montgomery see *Faith Founded on Fact* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1978); for D.A. Carson see his essay "Recent Developments in the Doctrine of Scripture" in D.A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge, editors, *Hermeneutics, Authority, and Canon* (Grand Rapids: Zondervon, Academie Books, 1986); Robert K. Johnston is discussed below, see pp. pp. xx-x.

[3] See J. Gresham Machen, *Christianity and Liberalism* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1946), pp. 6-7.

[4] For this quote and for the best survey of this period as a whole see George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), p. 219.

[5] For a more detailed discussion of these dynamics see Marsden. For special attention to the question of the separation of the Fundamentalist hermeneutical community from that of the liberal and academic communties see Mark Noll, *Between Faith and Criticism* (New York: Harper and Row, 1986).

[6] *The Fundamentals: A Testimony to Truth*, edited by R.A. Torrey, A.C. Dixon, and others (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1972; reprint of the 1917 edition published by the Bible Institute of Los Angeles), p. 11.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 37.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 42.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 37.

[10] *Ibid.*

[11] R.A. Torrey, *The Christ of the Bible* (New York: Geroge H. Doran Company, 1924), p. 12.

[12] *Ibid.*, p. vi.

[13] J. Gresham Machen, *What is Christianity?*, edited by N.B. Stonehouse (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1951), see Chapter One, "What is Christianity?," p. 22.

[14] J. Gresham Machen, *Christianity and Liberalism* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1946; originally published 1923), p. 7.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 6.

[16] See Marsden, p. 216.

[17] Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), "Religion as a Cultural System," p. 108.

[18] Alasdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*, 2nd edition (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1984), p. 263.

[19] See *Evangelical Action: A Report of the Organization of the National Association of Evangelicals for United Action*, compiled and edited by the Executive Committee of the NAE (Boston: United Action Press, 1942). For doctrinal basis of the organization see pp. 102-3.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 38.

[21] See "Reinhold Niebuhr's View of Scripture" in E. J. Carnell, *The Case for Biblical Christianity*, edited by Ronald H. Nash (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1969), pp. 97-110.

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 46.

[23] *Ibid.*, pp. 97-8.

[24] Carl F.H. Henry, *The Protestant Dilemma (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1949), pp.* 22-3.

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 38.

[26] Dewey M. Beegle, *The Inspiration of Scripture* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963), p. 131.

[27] *Ibid.*, pp. 180-8, passim.

[28] Bernard Ramm, *After Fundamentalism: The Future of Evangelical Theology* (New York: Harper and Row, 1983), p. 1.

[29] Harold Lindsell, *The Battle for the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976), p. 13.

[30] *Ibid.*, p. 37.

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 205.

[32] Robert K. Johnston, *Evangelicals at an Impasse* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1979), p. vii.

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 147.

[34] *Ibid.*, p. 151.

[35] John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1982), p. 137.

[36] William J. Abraham, *The Coming Great Revival* (New York: Harper and Row, 1984), pp. 27, 49.

[37] *Ibid.*, p. 98.

[38] Harvie M. Conn, *Eternal Word and Changing Worlds* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984), pp. 337-8.